

REMARKS

These Remarks are in response to the Final Official Action mailed June 14, 2007. No amendments are made in the present paper. Claims 1-18 and 27-32 are under consideration.

Request for Telephone Interview

The undersigned wishes to thank the Examiner for her courtesy during the telephone conversation held on Friday, September 7, 2007. During the conversation, the undersigned requested a telephone conference to discuss the merits of the case. The Examiner indicated that she would set up a conference in October, and would include the supervisory patent examiner.

To prepare for the conference, the Examiner requested that the undersigned submit the present paper outlining the points the undersigned wishes to discuss during the conference.

Overview of Points for Discussion

In the Final Official Action, the Examiner has repeated the rejection of all independent claims as anticipated by Williams. Applicant respectfully wishes to provide comments on the Examiner's Response to Arguments section contained in the Final Official Action, and to bring to the Examiner's attention a point made in the Response dated March 5, 2007 that was not addressed in the Final Official Action.

Examiner's 'Response to Arguments' Section of Final Official Action

The Examiner has asserted that on:

- Page 12, line 12, applicant argues that "Neither the connector sleeve 50 nor the contact finger 46 of Williams enter

that zone . . . to a “closed” position”. This argument is not found to be persuasive because this limitation is not in the claims.

Applicant asserts that the paragraph of Applicant’s Response referred to by the Examiner explicitly identifies the requirement of claim 1 that the actuator restrainer is “positioned substantially within the actuator operation zone.” The Examiner has not explained how the connector sleeve 50, which the Examiner has identified as anticipating the actuator restrainer of claim 1, is “positioned substantially within the actuator operation zone.”

In the “Response to Arguments” Section of the Final Official Action, the Examiner has additionally asserted (for the first time) that on:

- Page 14, paragraph 3, applicant argues that Williams does not disclose a “base component”. This argument is not found to be persuasive because Williams clearly discloses the “base component 10” in figure 3.

In fact, the element 10 of Williams referred to by the Examiner is the breaker box or casing in which the breaker is mounted (Williams, col. 3, lines 32-35). Claim 27 of the present application, to which that argument was addressed, requires the following two elements: (1) “a circuit breaker with a substantially planar face,” and (2) “a securement comprising a base component adapted to fit on the substantially planar face.” Applicant asserts that the breaker box 10 of Williams cannot be the base component of claim 27 because (a) the breaker box 10 does not comprise the securement; instead, it is part of the circuit breaker; and (b) the breaker box 10 is not “adapted to fit on a substantially planar face of the circuit breaker.”

Additional Point Not Addressed in the Final Official Action

The Examiner has not alleged that any element of any cited reference meets the following limitation contained in claim 1:

upon direct contact of the actuator with said actuator
restrainer, said actuator restrainer substantially resists manual
manipulation of the actuator from the first pole to the second pole.

No mention of that limitation is made in any of the Official Actions issued in the case. Applicant raised and argued that issue in detail in the March 5, 2007 Response. The Final Official Action contains no acknowledgement or rebuttal of the argument.

Clearly, the connector sleeve 50 of Williams, which the Examiner has identified as teaching the actuator restrainer of the claims, does not meet the above limitation at least because it is on the wrong side of the handle H (Williams, FIG. 3) to resist manipulation.


Conclusion

Applicant therefore respectfully asserts that claims 1-18 and 27-32 are in condition for allowance, and earnestly requests that the Examiner issue a Notice of Allowance.

The undersigned requests that the Examiner to schedule a telephone conference to discuss the points made in the present paper.

Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the present case, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully,

By 
Robert T. Canavan
Reg. No. 37,592
Telephone: 908-707-1568

Canavan & Monka LLC
62 Grove Street
Somerville, NJ 08876

Date: SEPT. 8, 2007